67. The method according to claim 42, wherein the synthetic random DNA sequences are coupled to coding sequences of purification tags in order to facilitate the purification and identification of expressed peptides.

68. The method according to claim 42, wherein the synthetic random DNA sequences are coupled to or inserted into the coding sequence of a protein.--

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 14, 22, 26, 30-31, and 41-42, cancelled Claims 19, 32, 33, 43-47, 49-52, and 54-58, and added new claims 59-68. Claims 1-18, 20-26, 30-31, 37-42, 48, 53, and 59-68 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 42 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the application.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives during the personal interview held September 21, 1999. At the interview the Examiner stated that the response filed July 29, 1999 was sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102(e) over Kay et al. Therefore the remaining issues are those of 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 103. The application has been amended to reflect the Examiner's comments and suggestions.

At the interview, the basis of patentability of Claim 43 was discussed. The Examiner objected to step (e) of Claim 43 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, due to lack of enablement and written description. Applicant argued that affinity purification, taught on page 17 of the

specification, was well known for accomplishing the isolation and identification of step (e). Applicant also argued that Claim 43 was enabled since Claim 43 was a method claim and the identified cellular target proteins themselves (as compositions) were not claimed. Since the Examiner indicated that the differences between Claim 43 and Claim 1 were not material to patentability, Claim 43 has been deleted to simplify the issues.

The Examiner also indicated that the differences between Claims 32 and 33 and Claim 1 were not material to patentability. These claims have therefore been deleted to simplify the issues.

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner suggested that limiting the claim to small molecules would be sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103 over Kay et al. Kay et al. discloses large molecules. The Examiner indicated that a limitation to small molecules would be inherent if Claim 1 were limited to synthetic totally random DNA sequences as in (d)(i), as such synthesis as a practical matter is applicable only to small molecules. Step (d)(ii)-(vi) could be converted to dependent claims. Step (d) of Claims 1 and 42 has been so amended. New Claims 59-68 are the converted dependent claims. New Claims 59-68 also replace Claim 19.

The Examiner also suggested the replacement of the term "phenotypic trait" with "cellular function" to further define Applicant's invention. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 14, 22, 26, 30-31, and 42 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Support for this amendment is found particularly on page 3, lines 34-38, and page 5, lines 19-25.

Claim 1, line 2 has been amended to replace the term "nucleic acids" with "ribonucleic acids" so that the claim language is consistent throughout.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 42, as well as the other pending claims, comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112 and 103(a). The present

application is in condition for allowance. In the event there are any issues which can be expedited by telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON, PRICE, HOLMAN & STERN, PLLC

By: Paula L. Craig #40,215
for D. Douglas Price
Registration No. 24,514

400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 638-6666
Atty. Docket No.: P61724US0
DDP/PLC/dlj
Date: September 29, 1999
R:\PCRAIG\Amdts-C\P61724US0.AMD